By letter dated Jan. 22, 1994, MIGA forwarded to Homer what it called its "official response" to the request for comments. The response consisted of a brief two-paragraph letter asserting that MIGA was "totally opposed to this action by the Wisconsin tribes." The letter attached three documents that had previously been sent to Interior: (1) MIGA's Dec. 1, 1993, letter to Babbitt; (2) MIGA Resolution 92-3; and (3) MIGA's Jan. 10, 1994, letter to Babbitt. The letter also stated that MIGA "would be happy to meet with you to discuss in more detail the particulars of our position." No supporting data was included with the response to substantiate the claim by the Minnesota tribes that a casino in Hudson would result in severe economic impact to their tribal operations.⁹⁰

On Feb. 8, MIGA sent another short letter to Director Homer extending an open invitation for her to attend MIGA meetings. Neither Homer nor any other MAO representative accepted this offer to discuss the casino proposal while it was pending at the Minneapolis Area Office. ⁹¹ In late 1994 – after the MAO had recommended approval of the Hudson application – a number of tribal leaders did meet with Homer at a meeting sponsored by the Minnesota Chippewa Tribes, the official governing body for six Chippewa reservations located in northern

⁹⁰Following MIGA's official response to BIA on Jan. 22, 1994, McCarthy sent a "reminder" memorandum to "All M.I.G.A. Tribes/M.I.G.A. Reps" regarding "B.I.A. Dog Track Response" on Jan. 27. The memo stated, in relevant part: "Just a reminder that the information requested by the Bureau on the impact of the St. Croix Dog Track purchase is due on <u>February 1</u>, <u>1994</u>." (Emphasis in original.)

⁹¹In MIGA's view, this invitation was not unusual. Homer's predecessor, Earl Barlow, who had been the Minneapolis Area Director since 1982, had attended MIGA meetings on a fairly frequent basis, and the Minnesota tribes felt that they had a very close working relationship with him. Barlow retired in October 1993 following allegations that he had improperly accepted complimentary vouchers for use at one or more of the Minnesota casinos. The contrast between Barlow's and Homer's interaction with MIGA and the Minnesota tribes may have caused the tribes to feel cut off from Homer.